Journal of Scientific Exploration, Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 328–330, 2017 0892-3310/17

Journal of Scientific Exploration, Vol. 31, No. 2 - Letter to the Publisher of *Phenomena* – **Stephan A. Schwartz**

BOOK REVIEW

Letter to the Publisher of *Phenomena*

Editor's Note: The following is a letter Stephen Schwartz sent to the publisher of ***Phenomena****, prior to the book's release, after being sent a galley of the section of the manuscript in which his work was represented. The letter itself explains the context.*

---

18 November 2016

Little Brown
Market Place Center
3 Center Plaza
Boston, MA 02108 enclosures

RE: PHENOMENA

Let me begin by telling you that I had hoped I would not have to write this letter, but I have no choice because as a scientist and historian I place accuracy, both factual and contextual, as a first priority.

Some months ago I had a brief telephone interview with one of your authors, Annie Jacobsen. I heard nothing further until I received an email on 16 November attached to which was a selection of pages for the upcoming book *Phenomena* covering my research with the admonishment my edits must be in her hands by "Sunday/Monday"—basically three days in the future. Since then I have exchanged 13 emails, and had three quite acrimonious telephone conversations, all very hurried because Ms. Jacobsen couldn't talk at length.

The first thing I noticed when I read pages 191–199 (which I enclose) that covered my research was that the narrative of what happened bore very little tangency to real events, or real context. Ms. Jacobsen made it explicitly clear that she was not interested "in your interpretation of events, only specific corrections." In response I pointed out multiple name misspellings, as well as incorrect institutional affiliations.

The funny thing about all of this was that her pages were describing events that occurred 40 years ago about which much has already been published. Indeed, Little Brown published my chapter on this entire event in 1984, in *Stories From Omni*. I also wrote about these experiments in my book *Opening to the Infinite*, as well as in numerous research papers presented at science conferences in several disciplines. A high school sophomore in five minutes of Googling could have obtained the correct information. Apparently Ms. Jacobsen couldn't be bothered to do any of that. I will simply offer you one example. On page 199 she says, "This was the first time in history that psychics had located an archaeological site."

In fact in 1978 Grosset & Dunlap published my book, *The Secret Vaults of Time*, which recounted multiple uses of remote viewing in archaeology over the previous century prior to my doing the experiment described in *Phenomena*. The book is still in print and can be found on Amazon. At least a dozen other books, and several dozen papers, reports, and articles over the past 40 years have also cited this research and discussed it at length. Searching Google for "remote viewing and archaeology" produces 187,000 "hits" mostly relating to my work but also much else. How could one miss that? When I challenged Ms. Jacobsen, her response was to cite cyrons on a television program, and her interview with a man named Dale Graff who played no role of which I am or

was aware in Project Deep Quest, and a once secret (now apparently declassified) document in the CIA files that he apparently wrote.

Ms. Jacobsen in pages 191–199 presents a narrative of a joint project carried out by SRI and myself, largely designed by Graff, and filmed by Leonard Nimoy for the old television show . . . *In Search Of*. In fact not one word of that [narrative] is correct.

I enclose the first paper on this study which I wrote in 1977, a few weeks after Project Deep Quest was carried out. I hate to ask you to read something, but if you will at least scan this, and read pages 191–199, and compare them you will see what I mean by tone and context. Let me add that I still retain all audio tapes, footage, letters, contracts, memoranda, field notes, and cancelled checks on the Deep Quest project in my files, and had I been contacted and asked about any of it, I would happily have provided the material, as I have frequently done in [the] past with many other journalists. A Google search on "Deep Quest and remote viewing" will produce hundreds of hits.

Ms. Jacobsen describes the project as having been funded in part by the Air Force. This is factually incorrect. I funded the project, along with the Institute for Marine and Coastal Studies of the University of Southern California, and the Canadian deep ocean technology company Hyco, Ltd. She describes part of the experiment as classified, in fact nothing I know about the experiment was classified.

Ms. Jacobsen, based on what she has written appears—I do not know

this to be correct, but her account suggests it—that SRI had lost their funding and used my experiment, claiming it in part as their own, and wrote a classified report to get new funding to save their program. Having spent a number of years as part of a senior government staff dealing with mostly classified material I am familiar with this ploy, and understand that they had no fear that any of this would be contradicted because it was classified and unknown to me or anyone else outside of that hermetically sealed world.

In this letter I have intentionally focused only on the part of *Phenomena* that covers my work, but I know from personal experience and direct firsthand accounts that the rest of the book is as inaccurate in both narrative and factual details as the part addressing my work. Most egregious of all, in my view, *Phenomena* does not even mention the contribution to Deep Quest of physicist Edwin May who joined the program in the 1970s, and was its director from 1985 until its end, and whose original and innovative work is responsible for much of the SRI program's reputation. Ms. Jacobsen also doesn't seem to mention that when the program ended at SRI, Dr. May was able to find it a new home at SAIC.

I have great regard for Little Brown. But I know every time a writer or editor lets something inaccurate slide the chances are it will be canonized through repetition. So I hope Ms. Jacobsen's manuscript can be corrected before publication.

Stephan A. Schwartz